

The Missouri Question
as presented by the
Missouri Compromise
1820

MISSOURI QUESTION,

BY

DANIEL RAYMOND, ESQ.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY
TAYLOR & MASON, 1817.

BALTIMORE.

1818.

MISSOURI QUESTION.

THINGS are no subject so interesting and important to the real friends of their country, as that of slavery, because there is none which involves the happiness, prosperity and glory of our country in so great a degree—none attended with so many difficulties in remedying. It is admitted by all parties, slave-holders or not, that slavery is the greatest curse our country is afflicted with—it is a foul stain upon our national escutcheon—A canker which is corroding the moral and political vitals of our country. There is but one voice on this subject, and that is the voice of condemnation, as an enormous, and an alarming evil.

But although there is such an union of sentiment, as to the existence and nature of the evil, there is a vast diversity of opinion as to the remedy to be applied, for its correction or its cure.

The true policy of every wise legislator is to consider his country immortal, and to legislate for it as if it were to exist forever; but unfortunately, most legislators act as though they thought their country as short lived as themselves, and instead of adopting a policy, which is to look prospectively to future generations and centuries; they adopt a policy which looks only to themselves and to the present race. Unless the fruits of a policy are to be gathered by themselves, they think it unworthy their attention. This is evidently the case in the Southern States, in regard to their policy towards their slaves. They regard slave slavery as the oldest and greatest curse, yet at the same time adopt measures calculated to increase it, and perpetuate it to the latest generations. They affect to despise the traitor, but they love the traitress. This may appear to be a bold charge, but I trust, I shall be able to make it good; which, if I do not, I shall be very ready to retract.

A writer in the Federal Gazette of the 23d Nov. under the signature of Phocion, says, "since the establishment of our independence, every state has engaged in the humane work of freeing our country from this curse, or where this could not be done with safety to the state or advantage to the slaves, in ameliorating their condition." This writer speaks the general sentiment of the southern public on this subject, but I trust I shall show before I conclude, that the southern states, Maryland excepted, not only have not done any thing towards freeing our country from this curse; but that they have on the contrary done and are doing all in their power, both to magnify the curse beyond all calculation, and to perpetuate it to the latest ages. That under the policy they are now pursuing, the evil will continue to increase in a geometrical ratio, and that there can be no hope of its ever being ameliorated—say farther, that *the policy* they are now pursuing, and *the policy* they wish the United States to adopt, will not only magnify and perpetuate the evil in the present slave holding states, but will extend it in all its horrors over a vast and boundless tract of country. I allude to the policy of permitting the new states west of the Mississippi, to become slave holding states. And here I will observe, that if the admission of slaves into the western world, would diminish the evil in the old slave states, I would say, *let them be admitted*. But I believe, I shall be able to prove upon the soundest principles of political economy, that the admission of slaves into those western states, so far from diminishing the evil in the old states, will have directly the contrary effect—that it will be the very means of preventing the southern states from ever ridding themselves of that curse. I shall also endeavour to free myself from the charge which Phocion brings against the eastern writers and eastern presses, of "upbraiding their neighbours, when they can suggest no remedy for the evil for which they upbraid them."

The idea, however, that this curse is to be increased and perpetuated through all succeeding generations, is very appalling, and our southern politicians either refrain from looking at so forbidding a picture, or they cast about for some remedy, which they flatter themselves, may mitigate its horrors. I shall attempt to show that they have not yet devised any plan that can in the smallest perceptible degree, effect their purpose, and that their policy is in fact increasing and perpetuating the evil upon their posterity. Slavery is a poisonous plant of vigorous and rapid growth—plant but a scion in any soil, and it will soon spread forth its pestiferous branches, overshadowing, choking and finally destroying every thing within the sphere of its influence.

The scheme most relied on at present for eradicating the curse of slavery from our soil, is the Colonization Society, and if we will listen without examination of the premises, to the fair and flattering promises and anticipations of some of its zealous, philanthropic and highly praiseworthy members, we shall be led to believe, that it will one day accomplish the object of its founders. But let us take heed that we do not deceive ourselves, and in so doing, be induced to rely upon a fallacious hope; to the neglect of more efficient means. Let it not be supposed that I am unfriendly to the Colonization Society. Such is not the fact—I am a member of that Society—I applaud the motives of its founders—and I believe it may be the means of doing much good, and so believing, I am ready to lend them all the assistance in my power.

But I say it is wholly and totally inadequate to the accomplishment of its professed object; and must and would in the nature of things be so; if it should receive the united support of the whole nation. It is not possible in the nature of things, to colonize the whole, or any considerable portion of the black population of this country; and of

cannot be made upon the evil
 of slavery. I am ready to grant, and I have no doubt the
 fact is so, that a flourishing colony may be established in
 Africa, but I deny that it is possible for us to send to that
 colony a twentieth part of the annual increase of the black
 population of this country. That being the fact, and as
 population increases in a geometrical ratio, it is utterly
 impossible by that means, to make any perceptible dimi-
 nution of the number of blacks in our country. On the
 contrary, the curse of slavery will continue to increase
 and that in a geometrical ratio too, in spite of the utmost
 efforts of the Society. But suppose it were possible for
 the Society to send a greater number annually to this co-
 lony, than the annual increase of the blacks by procreation;
 a supposition necessary in order to make any diminution
 of the present number of our blacks, would it be possible
 for the colony to receive them into its bosom? Suppose the
 colony were now established, and in as flourishing a condi-
 tion as could be expected by its most sanguine promoters?
 and suppose it contained 10,000 inhabitants. How many
 emigrants would it be able to receive in one year? Could it
 receive ten thousand? Surely not—that number could nei-
 ther find employment nor support—they would endanger
 and probably overturn the government. I should suppose
 one or two thousand at most, would be as many as it could
 with safety receive. How many could one of our western
 territories (containing 10,000 inhabitants) receive in one
 year? Could it receive any indefinite number? Must not
 that number bear a proportion to the numbers already there,
 in order to find support, protection, employment, and be
 subject to the existing government? And can it be suppos-
 ed a colony in Africa will enjoy more advantages, or be on
 a more favorable footing, than a colony in our own coun-
 try, and of our own free, enlightened and industrious citi-
 zens. Suppose half a million of emigrants, a twentieth

part of our population were to land in our country, in one year, could we find them support and employment, and would they not enlargeth our government?

I say then that emigrants to a colony, must bear a proportion, and that a small one, to the existing numbers in the colony, and of course that if the colony was now established under the most favorable circumstances, it would be utterly impossible for it to receive a twentieth part of the annual increase of our black population.

The present annual increase of the black population by procreation is at least 40,000; and does any man believe that it would be in the power of the whole United States, in one hundred years to establish a colony in Africa, capable of receiving 40,000 emigrants? It will be recollected also, that population increases in a geometrical ratio, and that our black population doubles at a moderate calculation at least three times in a century. Let any one then, who is apt at arithmetic, tell what will be the annual increase of our black population, a century hence, and then say whether he thinks it will be in the power of any Society, however powerful, to colonize a number equal to the then annual increase; a thing that must be done in order to keep down the black population to the number as it all then be. The idea then that the Colonization Society, can under any circumstances, have any perceptible effect in eradicating slaves from our soil, is utterly chimerical. It follows also, that we and our posterity are to be afflicted with the curse, to the latest ages, unless some other remedy is provided. And can the idea be for a moment endured, that for countless ages this poisonous plant is to infest our soil, blasting as with mildew, the beautiful tree of liberty? Can we endure the thought that millions and millions of our fellow creatures for ages to come shall be born to drag the wretched lives of slavery! Shall we leave our posterity to

grapple with this monster of iniquity, and possibly if not probably be finally overcome in the struggle? Or shall we not rather if it be possible, labour to eradicate it ourselves, before it takes deeper root in our soil and before its present formidable trunk shall become ten fold more formidable? It is an axiom as true as the first problem in Euclid, that if left to itself it will every year become more inveterate and more formidable. The policy that the southern states have for twenty years pursued and are now pursuing, will as surely and rapidly increase the curse as that the human species themselves will increase and multiply.

But I am asked what remedy can we adopt for the evil? Is there any means by which we can rid ourselves of this curse, without doing violence to the poor slaves, and without violating the laws of morality and religion, and without endangering our own safety? I do humbly trust there are such means—I do verily believe, we can rid ourselves of this curse, without doing violence or injustice to any man; without offending against the laws of religion or morality, and without endangering our own safety; and these means I will take the liberty of stating. Previous, however, to doing this, I must crave the patience of the reader, while I state a few statistical facts and calculations, as premises from which my conclusions are to be drawn—I will also observe that the extirpation of slavery from our country, is, and necessarily must be a work of time. A century to an individual is a long time; but to a nation, a short one, and a policy which looks prospectively a century and no more, may be a short sighted policy for a young, a rising, and rapidly growing nation in numbers, wealth, power and glory. Our policy in regard to the black population of our country, must not be a policy of years, but of centuries.

The first proposition which I will lay down, is *That in our country, a free black population does not increase by procrea-*

tion so fast by nearly 50 per cent in twenty years, as a white population in a non slave holding state.

2. That a free black population does not increase so fast by procreation as a slave population.

3. That the white population in a slave state, does not increase so fast by at least 30 or 40 per cent. in twenty years, as the same population does in a state where there are none, or but few slaves.

4. That a slave population increases by procreation, faster than the white population in a slave state.

And 5. (As a corollary from the foregoing propositions) that in proportion as you restrain the increase of a slave population, you promote the increase of the white population; and then the question for politicians to decide, arises, to wit: Whether that policy is best which promotes the increase of a free white population, by restraining the increase of a slave population, or that which promotes the increase of a slave population, by restraining the increase of a free white population. And can there be any doubt upon this question? Does that man live and breathe the air of this free country, who would dare to say, that a legislature ought to hesitate for a moment, in adopting that policy which would promote the increase of a white population, rather than of a black slave population? If there be such a man, he is a disgrace to his species.

Let us see then whether these propositions are true or false. And here I will promise, that I will ask no man to give his credence to any one of them until they are proved by incontrovertible facts—facts which he cannot himself deny. But when so proved, I trust every honest and candid man who loves his country more than his self, will not only believe, but act upon them, and use his influence to carry them into effect.

The data of my calculations are taken from the census collected by the laws of Congress, in 1790 and 1810. Unless these data are false, or unless figures will lie, the conclusion must be true. In 1790, the whole number of slaves in the United States, was 6,97,697. In 1810, the whole amount of slaves was

1,191,364

Total increase in 20 years

463,667

The ratio of increase during that period was

70 per cent and a fraction.

From the above amount deduct

37,667

the number of slaves in Louisiana in 1810, and it leaves

455,996

The nett amount of increase in the old United States in 20 years. And the ratio of increase in 20 years, was 65 and a fraction per cent.

But admitting that the slave population in the United States, increases in a ratio of only 60 per cent in 20 years, and the slave population at the next census will be

1,541,773

And in 1830, it will be

1,906,182

And the annual increase during that period,

will be

35,740

This is exclusive of the increase of the free

black population, which may be estimated

at a moderate calculation, annually at

5,000

Does any one believe that the Colonization Society can grapple with such a many headed monster as this, with any hope of victory? It could make no more impression upon such a mass of continually increasing population, than a man could upon the waters of the Chesapeake Bay, by lading buckets full from it.

In 1790, the white population in the five New England states, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware, was

1,776,510

In 1810, the white population in the same states, was

3,408,899

The total increase in 20 years, was

1,760,389

The ratio of in 20 years in these states, was 99 per cent. wanting a fraction.

The black population, (I shall call it the free black population as the greater portion of it was so) in those states in 1790, was

80,130

In 1810 the free black population in those states was

119,450

The total increase in 20 years, was

59,270

The ratio of increase in that time of the free black population of those states, was 48 per cent. and a small fraction. The ratio of increase of the free black population, not being quite half so great as the ratio of increase of the white population. Unaccountable as this may appear, yet it is a fact, and I submit it to any intelligent man, whether it can be accounted for without admitting the truth of my first proposition.

It is a well known fact, that there is no emigration of free blacks, or indeed of any blacks, from any of those States: on the contrary, there is a considerable emigration of blacks to them from the other states, especially of runaway slaves. Admitting that some emigrate to Ohio from those states, (which, by the way, is not the fact,) and still the number of whites that emigrate from those states is ten to one of the blacks that emigrate in proportion to their number. It is an undoubted fact, that a slave population increases much faster by procreation than a free black population. A very considerable portion of the blacks of those states, during this period, were slaves, and of course the increase was much greater than it would have been had all the blacks of those states been free, so that the above estimate shows a much greater increase of the free black population in proportion to the

white population than is actually true. Neither can this difference be accounted for by the emigration of whites to those states. It is a well known fact, that the emigration from those states, from the year 1790 to the year 1810, was vastly greater than the emigration to them, including all foreigners. There is not a state in the Union, (and it might almost be said, a place on the globe,) which has not a large number of emigrants from those states; and the states of Ohio and Indiana have been settled, almost exclusively, by emigrants from them. The fact, then, incontestibly is, that the difference between the increase of a white population and a free black population in our country, is much greater than appears by the above estimate, that is, that a white population will more than double twice, while a free black population is doubling once.

It is unnecessary to account for this curious fact,—it is enough for my purpose to show that it is a fact; but there is no difficulty in accounting for it upon philosophical principles. The blacks do not stand upon an equal footing with the whites in a civil point of view.—They are more degraded—they have not the same motives for exertion and of course they are not so industrious, enterprising, and provident as the whites, and do not marry and raise so many children. It certainly is not a new discovery in the science of population, that the lowest classes of society do not have so many children as the middle classes.

The second proposition is, *that a free black population does not increase so fast by procreation as a slave population.*—The truth of this proposition has already been proved. We have already seen that the slave population of the U. States from 1790 to 1810, increased 65 per cent and a fraction, exclusive of the slaves in Louisiana; whereas, the increase of the free black population in the same slave-holding states, was only 48 and a fraction per cent. in the same time, which, by the way, is an over estimate for a

black population entirely free, because a large portion of what are called a free black population in these states, were, in fact, slaves, and of course, increased faster than if they had been all free.

But it may be said, that during a part of this period, the slave population was increased by importations from Africa and other places, the slave trade not having been prohibited till 1808. Although the importations in point of fact, have not been great enough to produce a twentieth part of this difference of increase, yet for the sake of preventing all cavilling on this point, and of convincing the most incredulous, let us examine it a little more in detail.

The slave population (I shall call it such, because it was almost entirely so) in Georgia, 1790, was 29,602
In 1810, it was 107,019
The ratio of increase was 267 and a fraction in 20 years.

In Kentucky the slave population in 1790 was 12,544
In 1810 it was 82,284
The ratio of increase in 20 years was 554 and a fraction per cent.

This enormous increase of the slave population in Georgia and Kentucky in 20 years, was produced in a great measure by emigration from the other states. And from this fact I have an important conclusion to draw hereafter. I will just allude to it here. The emigration to those states was principally from the Carolinas, Virginia, and Maryland, but the curse of slavery has not been at all diminished in those states. The poisonous plant has been transplanted from these older states to the new—it has taken deep root and flourished in a most alarming degree, yet the vigour and fecundity of the parent stock is not in the least abated or retarded.—The same observation apply to Tennessee and the other new states holding slaves.

But to proceed in our calculations.—In North Carolina the slave population in 1790 was 105,517

In 1810 it was 179,090
 The increase of slave population in 20 years was 70 per cent. wanting a small fraction.

In S. Carolina the slave population in 1790 was 108,395
 In 1810 it was 200,909
 The ratio of increase in 20 years was 84 per cent. and a small fraction.

Thus it appears that in the Carolinas the slave population increases at from 70 to eighty-four per cent. in 20 years, while the free black population does not increase more than 48 per cent. in the same time, at the greatest, and probably not more than 35 or 40 per cent. It may, however, be said, that as the importation of slaves into the Carolinas was not prohibited till 1808, this excess of increase is owing to importation. But every man who knows any thing about these states, knows that the emigration of slaves from those states to Georgia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, has been much greater since 1790 than the importation from all parts of the world.

But let us proceed to Virginia and Maryland where the same objection will not apply. In 1778 Virginia passed a law prohibiting the importation of slaves into that state, not only from Africa but from the neighbouring states. In 1783 Maryland passed a similar law. These laws have been in force in those states ever since, with the exception that Maryland permitted the exiles from St. Domingo to bring their slaves into this state from 1793 till 1797. The increase of slaves in these states therefore, is entirely by procreation. There has, during all the time since 1790, been a constant efflux from these states, to Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and all the western slave states. Slave owners moving from these states, not only took their slaves with them, but there has been a very extensive trade carried on from these states, particularly Maryland, to the south and west. Thousands have been carried, or rather, chained

together, and driven off annually. But notwithstanding all this, let us see whether the curse of slavery has been at all diminished in these states, or whether the original stock does not still flourish in all its vigour.

The slave population in Virginia, in 1790, was 365,499
 In 1810, it was 425,088
 The ratio of increase, in 20 years, is 39 and a fraction per cent.

In 1790, the slave population of Maryland was 111,079
 In 1810, it was 145,422
 The ratio of increase, in 20 years, is 31 per cent. wanting a small fraction. It is to be observed in relation to Maryland, that, in 1810, almost one quarter of the black population of the state was free.—The part which was free did not increase so fast as if they had been slaves, but I have made the calculation as though they were all slaves. The result, therefore, shows too small an increase for the actual slave population. The same observation applies, though in a lesser degree, to all the other states.

It is well known, that Kentucky has been settled principally by Virginia. It was formerly a part of that state. A very large proportion of the slaves in Kentucky, are Virginia slaves, or the offspring of Virginia slaves.

Now, take Virginia and Kentucky together, and the ratio of increase of the slave population is about 59 per cent. in 20 years.

From these various estimates, then, it appears, that, taking the whole slave population of the United States together, and the ratio of increase is 65 per cent. and a fraction in 20 years. While the ratio of increase of the free blacks, in the non slave-holding states, is only 48 per cent. supposing all the blacks in these states to be free, which not being the case, this last estimate is much too large.

That in all the other states, except Virginia and Maryland—the difference between the ratio of increase is much greater. That the proportional small increase of slaves in Virginia and Maryland can be accounted for from other sufficient causes, as will be shown more fully hereafter. I shall therefore take it for granted, that my second proposition is established.

My third proposition is, *that the white population in a slave state, does not increase so fast, by at least from 99 to 50 per cent. in 20 years, as the same population does in a state where there are none, or but few slaves.*

We have already seen, that the white population in the eastern, or non-slave-holding states, including the five New England states, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, increased in a ratio of 99 per cent. in 20 years. We have also seen that this increase was a natural and not an artificial increase. Now, let us contrast with this, the increase of the white population in the slave-holding states. We will begin with Maryland, which, in 1790, contained a white population of 208,649

In 1810	285,117
Total increase in 20 years	26,468

And a ratio of increase in 20 years of not quite 13 per cent. The increase of black population, it will be recollected, was 31 per cent. There is an awful difference between a ratio of 99 per cent. in 20 years, and 13 per cent. The state of Maryland, exclusive of the city of Baltimore, had not more, if as many, white inhabitants in 1810, as it had in 1790. This looks alarming, but if any one doubts the fact, let him make the calculation himself. This small increase, however, is not to be attributed entirely to the influence of slavery. There has been a very great emigration from the state, both of whites and blacks.

In 1790, Virginia contained a white population of

442,117

In 1810,	551,534
Total increase	109,417

The ratio of increase in 20 years not quite 25 per cent. There is a vast difference between 25 and 99 per cent., and the cause, whatever it may be, which has produced this difference, ought to be removed. It is true, there has been a great emigration from Virginia, especially to Kentucky, but not one equal to the whole white population in Kentucky in 1810. But suppose we admit that it was,

all the difference is vastly in favour of the non slave-holding states.

Virginia and Kentucky together, in 1790, contained a white population of

In 1810	875,551
Total increase in 20 years	366,371

The ratio of increase in 20 years, 71 and a fraction per cent. Still we see there is a vast difference in favor of the non slave-holding states. But if Kentucky has been settled by Virginia, so has Ohio by New England, and not only Ohio, but all the other states, more or less. There can be no assignable cause for this difference in the increase of these different states, but that foul and poisonous one, of slavery.

North Carolina in 1790, contained a white population of

In 1810	576,410
Total increase in 20 years,	88,386

The ratio of increase in 20 years, was 30 and a fraction per cent. The increase of the slave population during the same time, was 70 per cent. wanting a small fraction.

In 1790 South Carolina contained a white population of

In 1810	214,126
Total increase in 20 years	80,617

Ratio of increase in twenty years is 64 per cent. increase of the population during the same time was 84 per cent. There was a considerable migration to South Carolina during this period, both of white and black population. Still the increase of the white population was not so great by 35 per cent. as in the non slave holding states. The increase of white population in Georgia, from 1790, to 1810, was 275 per cent. but it is manifest that this was produced principally by emigration. The increase of the slave population was nearly in the same proportion. In Kentucky the white population increased in twenty years, 430 per cent., the black 554, and in Ohio, the increase of the white population has been still vastly greater. But these new states can afford no data by which to ascertain the natural increase of a population.

From all these estimates, it is clear, that the white population in a slave state, does not increase so fast as the white population in a non slave holding state, nor is this difference a small one. It is at a moderate calculation a difference of from 40 to 60 per cent. in 20 years. The difference is 66 per cent. against Maryland, 74 against Virginia, 68 against North Carolina, and 35 per cent. against South Carolina. This is certainly a matter of no trifling consideration. The great end of government in our country, is to promote the increase of our species, especially the free portion of them; and any cause, whatever it be, that prevents their increase, ought to be removed. There can be no doubt that slavery is the primary cause of the white population in the southern states, not increasing so fast as in the northern. I admit there may, and doubtless are at present, other immediate causes to be found in the manners, customs and habits of the people; but this difference in the manners, customs and habits of the people, is traceable to slavery as the primary cause. If the southern people are less industrious, less enterprising, less pro-

vident, it is because they are and have been cursed with slavery. It is an old maxim, that idleness is the parent of vice and dissipation, but there is nothing which so much conduces to idleness in a white population as slavery.— May it not then be said that slavery is a poisonous plant which takes deep root in any soil, and shoots forth its vigorous branches in all directions, blasting, withering, and ultimately destroying every goodly plant. Is it not in fact that *bohun upas* which has been supposed to exist only in the imagination of fanciful travellers?

The reasons why the white population does not increase so fast in a slave state, as in a state where there are no slaves, are neither doubtful nor mysterious. They are apparent to the most superficial observer.

It is a self-evident axiom, that population or the increase of population must be limited to the means of subsistence. The human species cannot increase where there is nothing to subsist on. It is an established fact, that the human species, where the means of subsistence are abundant, are capable of doubling their numbers every fifteen years at least, some say less. We have seen already that they doubled in a portion of our country, by natural increase, in about twenty years. If they are capable of doubling in twenty years, or in any given time, then they increase in a geometrical ratio. In other words, if one million will increase to two millions in twenty years, then upon the same principle that two will, provided the means of subsistence are equally abundant, increase to four in forty years, that four to eight in eighty years, that eight to sixteen in a century, and so on to thirty-two millions in twenty years more. It is however manifest that the earth cannot be made to produce an equal increase of the means of subsistence. Hence it follows that the increase of the human species is by the laws of God (for the laws of nature are God's laws,) restrained or limited to

the power of the earth to yield them subsistence. If all the product of the earth be consumed by slaves, a white population cannot subsist; and whatever portion of the product of the earth be consumed by slaves, in the same proportion will the means of subsistence be taken from a white population, and in the same proportion will the increase of the white population be limited or restrained. In other words, every slave in the world, especially in our country occupies the place of a free man. Nay he does much more than this, for I will show hereafter that no country can in the nature of things contain or support so many human beings where slavery exists, as it would do if there was no slavery.

In all countries the great mass of the population is poor and obliged to depend upon manual labour for the subsistence of themselves and families. This is as much the case in the slave states, as in those where there are no slaves—A large portion of the white population in the southern states, are neither slave owners nor land owners, and are as much dependant on the labor of their lands for subsistence as the eastern people. But where slavery abounds they have no market for their labour—they cannot obtain employment. How then are they to raise families? Besides, it is in slave states a disgrace for white people to labour—the labourer is reduced to the level of slaves. No man will therefore labour, who can avoid it. Hence the middling class of society, what are properly called the yeomanry of the country, and by the way the most valuable part of every community, not having property enough to raise families without their own manual labour, prefer living single, (and as they call it respectably) to marrying and raising families, which they would be obliged to disgrace by manual labour. That this is universally the case I do not pretend; that it is very generally so cannot be denied.

I have said that no country can support as many human beings where slavery exists, as it would do if there was no slavery. We have already seen that population is always restrained and kept down to the means of subsistence. The means of subsistence depends upon the industry of man—the earth yielding more or less abundantly, in proportion to the labour bestowed upon it. It is ordained of God that it shall be so. There certainly needs no argument to prove that slaves are less industrious, and less faithful in their labours, than a free white population who labour for their own benefit, and reap that which they sow, universal experience proves that this is the case. It follows then that slaves will never produce the means of subsistence so abundantly as free whites, and of course so many of them cannot subsist in the same country.

The most important proposition still remains to be examined, which is, *that a slave population increases faster than the white population in a slave state.* A most momentous and alarming proposition this! one which portends more mischief, misery, insurrection, bloodshed and desolation to our country and our race, than any the imagination can conceive, provided the present policy of the southern states in regard to their slaves is still pursued. Who can tell what is to be the issue of this, and where it is to end? If the slave population increase faster than the white, it will ere long be the most numerous, and not only the most numerous, but vastly the most numerous. And shall ten men be in subjection to one, or will a thousand quietly remain in bondage to an hundred? Such things cannot be—it was not intended by Him who made the black man as well as the white, that such things should be. We may put far off the evil day, but it will surely come upon us or our posterity.—The day of desolation and wrath is sure to overtake us, unless we avert it by a timely reformation of our policy. But before we frighten ourselves with this picture, let us see whether it be a true representation.—

To ascertain this fact we have nothing to do but to bring together the different calculations already made.

We have found by calculation that while the white population of Maryland was increasing 13 per cent. the black or slave population increased 31 per cent.

In Virginia, white increase	24
slave do	38
In North Carolina, white do.	30
slave do.	70
In South Carolina, white do.	64
slave do.	84
In Georgia, white do.	275
slave do.	267
In Kentucky, white do.	450
slave do.	534

So we see that in all the states except Georgia, (which is by no means a fair criterion) the difference is in favour of the slaves, and in Virginia where the difference is smallest, it is little more than three to two in twenty years, that is, while the white population is doubling twice, the slaves will double three times and more. At this rate in less than two centuries the slaves in Virginia will be more than twice as numerous as the whites. But if we take either Maryland or the Carolinas, as the most probable ratio of difference, which is no doubt the fact, and this dreadful catastrophe (for a catastrophe there undoubtedly would be) would happen much sooner. It appears then that this shocking picture is a true representation, and can any man who loves his country look upon it without terror—can we view this state of things and let it pass on, without once calculating what will be its consequences to posterity? In stead of devising, ways and means to arrest, shall we go on increasing, extending and perpetuating its progress?

That the slave population does increase faster than the white in the slave states is an undoubted fact, nor is there

any difficulty in accounting for it. A population increases always faster or slower in proportion to the means of subsistence. If the means of subsistence are sufficiently abundant, it will double in fifteen, twenty, fifty or an hundred years in proportion to that abundance. In many of the countries of Europe, the population does not double in less than a century, and in some others the increase is still slower. This certainly is not owing to any deficiency in the power of procreation, nor to wars or pestilence, but to a want of the means of subsistence. If the population of Great Britain were to increase as fast as the population of some of our states, the island could not contain them a century hence if they stood side by side.

The reason then why a slave population increases faster than the white in a slave state, is because their means of subsistence are more abundant. The slaves usually belong to men of wealth, who have the means of supplying them with food, and whose interest it is that the slaves should multiply as fast as possible, at least it is their interest so long as there is a demand for slaves, and the increase of the slaves will always be proportionate to the demand. The greater and more extensive the market, therefore the faster they will increase. They are raised as an article of traffic, the same as cattle and horses, and the market regulates the increase of the one in the same manner that it does the other. If the market would justify it, we should see masters promoting the increase of their slaves, treating their breeding slaves with the same care, and nursing their offspring with the same attention and tenderness, that they now bestow upon their breeding mares and their foals. When this comes to be the case we shall find that the slave population will double at least every fifteen or twenty years, and there is nothing wanting to make this increase but an extensive demand and a high market.

It being then established, that the human species cannot multiply indefinitely, but must be limited in their increase to the means of subsistence, and it being also established, that a slave population will increase faster than a white, in a slave state, and that a white population, where there are no slaves, will increase faster than a slave, it follows as an irresistible conclusion or corollary, that in proportion as you restrain the increase of a slave, in the same proportion do you promote the increase of a white population in the slave state. But lest there should be any scepticism as to this conclusion, let us examine it more minutely. We have already seen that a white, increases faster than a free black population, by more than fifty per cent. in 20 years. We have already inquired into the causes of this difference. But in order to bring the whole reasoning into one view, I will here state again some of these causes. They consist in the superior advantages, political and moral, which the whites enjoy over the blacks,—their superiority in intelligence, enterprise, and provident habits, which enables them to make better and more effectual provision for their families, and to marry and raise more children. In a political point of view, the blacks are a crippled race, they have not the same motives for exertion, they have no property, imprudent, and of course, incapable of self-improvement. These are sufficient grounds to account for the difference, and according to the rules of exact reasoning, we are not to attribute an effect to more causes than are necessary to account for it. If here all the slaves in Virginia were free, they would not increase so fast by twenty or thirty per cent. at least, in 20 years, as they now do, nor as fast as the white population, or the free black population, and even, if a half, a third, or less of the population were free. The same of course would be immediately increased, if the population of 200,000 slaves were reduced to 100,000.

scope for exertion; there would be a greater market for their labour, and gradually, a change produced in their habits and manners,—they would become more industrious, thrifty, and provident, and not only have the means, but the disposition also, to marry and raise families. If this were mere theory, I should have less confidence in it; but facts are stubborn things, and facts well authenticated prove this theory to be true.

The question is not, as a superficial observer might at first view suppose, whether the increase of the human species ought to be restrained in an absolute sense, but whether the increase of one portion of them, ought to be restrained, in order to promote the increase of another. In other words, whether the best policy is to raise a million of free white men, or a million of slaves, or rather, whether the best policy is to raise a million of free men, or half a million of slaves, for we have already seen, that the earth will not support so many slaves as free men. Both we cannot raise, for the earth cannot support both. The earth cannot support an unlimited number.—There must be a restraint placed directly or indirectly somewhere. In whom shall it be placed? that is the question. And does this question admit of a clerical, a political, a moral, an historical, and a religious point of view, to raise a white population better than a black one?

But this is not the only light in which this question ought to be viewed. If the present policy of increasing, extending, and perpetuating slavery, is persisted in, what will be, in our country, the consequences? to partially, to our country, to the slave, to our young and old population? These consequences are portentous and terrifying. If, in the name of God, (his exceptions may be used as an excuse,) still, the decrees of men shall pass, that shall say that some men are not taken to reward and punish, — slavery will be permitted to demand a popu-

terity with accumulated force, there will, as surely, sooner or later, be a day of retribution and wrath, as there is a God in Heaven. This may not happen in one century, or perhaps in two, but happen it will. And what is a century in the probable period allotted to a nation's existence? Am I asked how I propose to remedy this enormous evil, and avert these threatening calamities? By adopting directly the opposite policy from that at present pursued by all the slave states, Maryland excepted.—By passing laws authorising masters to manumit their slaves, and by promoting their manumission as fast as possible. In Maryland, masters have been permitted to manumit their slaves since 1796, and at this day, nearly one third of the black population of the state, are free, and in less than fifty years, the slaves will be a very small portion of the black population, and the whole, will bear a much smaller proportion to the white population than it now does.—The white population will increase in a greater, and the black, in a smaller ratio, until this eldest curse shall be eradicated. For we have already seen that a white population will increase faster than a black one. In all the other slave states, the manumission of slaves, is, I believe, prohibited by laws of some kind, such in the case in part of those in Virginia, there is a manumission law, qualified with a proviso, that the manumitted slave be sent to which, we are bound to send all slaves sent to him, as free persons. But already, I think, it is well known, that the policy of prohibiting manumission, is to perpetuate the evil to all eternity, and to have the it perpetuated by each succeeding generation, and yet to wait for the national feeling to rise, and have been highly successful in our of the in this respect. In Virginia, man can consent to this policy and to be an owner, but he can not. The case of a Virginia, I repeat, I understand, manumitted, (1820), and she has no compensation to be made for her manumission, but

rashly *humane*." Of Georgia, he says, "she has repealed her manumission law. That state has acted firmly, wisely, and, I have no doubt, humanely. The people there, have met the subject fairly—they have looked the difficulties before them in the face, and amidst a choice of evils, they have, I am very confident, selected the least." Misguided, short-sighted, infatuated man! Are you aware of the pernicious tendency of the policy you so highly commend? Are you aware that that policy will promote the increase of the slave population, at the expense of the white? Are you aware, if that policy is persisted in, that before many generations shall have passed away, the slave population will double the number of the white? Are you aware, that such a policy will restrain the aggregate increase of the human species? that that policy will plant millions of slaves upon the soil of Georgia, while a different one would plant millions of free men there? Are you aware, that the policy you commend, will increase the power, and charge with malignity, a volcano which must one day burst upon the devoted heads of posterity? May a merciful God avert the mischief of such counsels, and save our country and posterity from their consequences!

But we are told, by those who oppose the manumission of slaves, that when manumitted they become a nuisance to society, and that their condition is worse, when free, than when a slave. And suppose we admit this: does it at all affect the great points of the case? If free negroes are a nuisance to society, are not slaves, and the consequences of slavery, an infinitely greater nuisance? What are the objections of a parcel of idle, vagabond, roving blacks, submitting themselves all to be such, in comparison to the unnumberable mischief of slavery? The *real* chiefs of one, are only for a generation or two at most, for the idle, vagabond blacks do not raise families, or comparatively none;—if they are industrious, provided, but vain boodlers, then

they are good citizens, and teach their children to become such. The mischiefs of the other are interminable. In short, the character of transmitted slaves, materially changes in the course of one or two generations. The industrious thrive and increase,—their offspring, accustomed to liberty, acquire the habits of the whites, and make equally as good citizens, that is, the laboring class.—Such is the fact in Maryland,—experience proves, that such will be the fact every where. The worthless come to naught.

And as to the slaves being in a worse condition after manumission than before, it is all idle cant, prompted by the self interest of those who are unwilling to emancipate their slaves, because of that self interest. What would you say of a father, who should keep an idle, dissolute son in perpetual bondage, because, if permitted to have his liberty, he would prejudice himself? You would say he was a brutal tyrant, because he undertook to exercise authority where he had no right. The son is a free agent as well as the father, and has the same right to exercise his volition, and to judge of his own conduct, being himself solely accountable for his actions. The same reasoning applies with still stronger force in the case of slaves, especially when we consider the pernicious consequences of the opposite doctrine. It has been a favorite dogma with some politicians, as well as with a certain denomination of Christians, that we are justified in doing evil, that good may come and come, in effect, is the doctrine of those who hold that we ought not to manumit our slaves, lest an injury should be done them instead of a benefit. This abominable doctrine, however, is, thank God, very nearly excluded from modern political, as well as modern religious belief. There is no other rule, in all the relations of life, than to do our own duty, and leave the result to God.—Thus is the rule I would have adopted in regard to our slaves.

But I may, perhaps, be asked, whether I would have the slaves forcibly manumitted by law? By no means. Let masters be permitted to manumit their slaves, or not, as seemed to them good.—This is all that is required. Such a law would promote their manumission fast enough for the present. It would also cause the manumission to be gradual, so that no great and sudden change would be produced in Society. This would open a vein which would let out the polluted blood of slavery from the body politic, silently, constantly, and gradually, without endangering its health. The manumitted slaves would gradually acquire the habits of free men, and become good citizens, or dwindle to nothing. After a large portion of this poisonous blood had thus escaped, its final extinction might be forced by a law such as has been passed by most of the eastern states, limiting a period, after which, all that were born should be free at a certain age. This is not merely a plausible theory, but it is founded on fact and experience.

When we consider how much pains is taken to persuade the people that it is a sin to manumit; that those who manumit, not only do an injury to their slaves, but to their country.—When the apostles of slavery preach its divine origin,* and have the audacity not only to quote the Pen-

* See the writer in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* signing himself "An American." The reasoning of this writer is not a little curious, and we sincerely tremble whether to smile at its weakness, or frown at its audacity. He cites the the curse which Noah pronounced upon Ham, as a justification of slavery. "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be, &c." His reasoning is that Noah's curse was a prophecy, and, according to Bishop Newton, slaves are the descendants of Ham. "The present condition of the Africans is therefore inexorable, and all efforts to extinguish black slavery are futile." If this be a legitimate conclusion, there certainly can be no moral profit in slavery. The amount of this is, that if it has been prophesied that a thing shall happen, it is morally right that it should happen. If this be true, then all the oppression, persecution, tyranny,

attach, but the pure and holy doctrines of our blessed Saviour and his apostles, as authority: it is not surprising that manumission does not go on faster in those states where it is permitted. But let this subject be rightly understood,—let the people know and feel that they are benefiting their country, posterity, and doing an act of justice to the slaves themselves, by manumitting them, and the work will go on fast enough.—(The greatest danger would be, that it would go on too fast,—Let it be thus understood, and let masters be permitted to manumit their slaves, and in a century, slaves would be as scarce in the southern states, as they are now in the northern.

The main question still remains to be discussed. That question is the policy of admitting slavery into the new states hereafter to be formed beyond the Mississippi. A more momentous question has never been agitated in Congress—a more momentous question has never been agitated in this country since the declaration of independence. I am aware of its importance—I am aware of the interest it excites in the southern states—I am aware of its delica-

and destruction that the Jews have suffered for thousands of years, was morally right; for if any man read the 26th chapter of Leviticus, and the 21st ch. of Deut. and see whether it has not all been prophesied. If this be true, then Judas committed no moral guilt in betraying his lord and master, nor the Jews, in putting him to death, for it was all prophesied.

Again, this champion of slavery, and redoubtable legend, quotes some of the parables of our Saviour, by which he illustrates the relation which exists between man and his God, by the familiar comparison of a master and his servants; from which he draws the conclusion, that Jesus Christ gave slavery "his sanction." A most lame and impudent conclusion.

Lastly, this writer *prays* in aid of his doctrine, the authority of St. Paul and St. Peter. These apostles, it seems, exhorted servants to be obedient to their masters, with fear and trembling—"to please them in all things, not answering again, showing all good fidelity, &c." Therefore the apostles justified slavery. In other words, because they did not preach rebellion and insurrection to servants, they preached tyranny, oppression, and perpetual slavery to the masters.

cy—of the angry feelings it has already produced, and being aware of all these things, I would wish to treat the subject if possible, in a manner calculated to assuage these feelings, and produce reflection and calculation in the thinking part of the community, rather than abuse or evil thinking of those gentlemen who differ with them in opinion, as being actuated with a disposition to do a thing either unjust, unconstitutional, or impolitic.

This question naturally divides itself into two branches, 1st, What effect upon those new states will the introduction of slavery produce? 2d, What effect will it produce upon the old slave holding states? In other words, will either the old states or the new, be benefitted by such introduction, or will both be prejudiced by it? I purposely leave out all consideration of the slaves themselves in the discussion of this question. I am willing to discuss it like a politician, without any regard to the iniquity, morality, or injustice, which it may involve. If I show that the introduction of slavery into these states will not only prejudice the new states but the old ones also, I shall expect the southern gentlemen to join heart and hand with the northern, in preventing so great a curse. I expect to be able to do this.

As it regards the first branch of this question, I believe there is very little difference of opinion between the northern and southern gentlemen. It is generally admitted that slavery is a curse to any state, and of course it would be a curse to these new states. The calculations and observations which have been already made, are, I think, sufficient to satisfy any man whose mind is not impervious to the power of argument, of the truth of this fact. Slavery would restrain the increase of the white population in those states which is of itself sufficient to satisfy any man of its injurious tendency, who does not think a slave a more valuable member of society, than a free white citizen. I

shall therefore take it for granted, that the introduction of slavery into those states would be a curse to them; and proceed to examine the second branch of the question, to wit: *what effect would the introduction of slavery into those new states have upon the old slave states.* If I show that it would have no good effect—that it would not in the smallest degree alleviate the evil of slavery in those states—I shall show all that will be necessary to secure the cordial co-operation of every honest man in preventing its introduction. It is true there are men who would have slavery introduced into those states for their own individual profit, even though they knew the ruin of the states, both old and new, in the next generation, would be the consequence.—But I hope and trust there are not many, if any such men in Congress.

I am in the first place then, to show that the introduction of slavery into the new states west of the Mississippi, will not have any good effect in mitigating the evil of slavery in the old slave states.—And secondly, that it would have positively a bad effect in perpetuating the evil, and preventing it from ever being remedied. It appears to me that to a man well informed on the science of population; (for it is in fact a science) or well versed in the history of slavery in the southern states, very little need be said to convince him of the truth of my first position. We have already seen that a population increases faster or slower in proportion to the means of subsistence. It is also true that a population increases faster or slower in proportion to the demand for it. It is as true of slaves as of cattle, horses, or any other article of merchandize, that the greater the demand, and the more extensive the market, the faster they will increase. Who ever heard that increasing the demand for an article, was the means of diminishing its quantity or preventing its increase? We have seen that the human species are capable of doubling by natural

increase every fifteen or twenty years—and we have seen that they will do this where the means of subsistence are abundant. It is then possible to make the demand for slaves so great, and their means of subsistence so abundant, as that they shall double every 20 years at most.—And what measure could be adopted which would have so strong a tendency to produce this effect, as opening a boundless market for them in the western country, and thereby making it the interest of slave owners not only, not to manumit their slaves, (the only means by which the evil of slavery can ever be cured) but also making it their interest to increase their numbers by every means in their power? The mischief of this is heightened in a ten fold degree, when we consider that this increase of slaves operates as a restraint upon the increase of the white population, not only in the old states, but in the new. The relative difference between the number of the white and black population is changing every year against the whites. In short, the *bohun upas* of slavery can never be extirpated by plucking off its branches, for they will increase faster than they can be plucked. If you would destroy the plant, you must dig up the root. Suppose then 50,000 slaves were to be annually exported to the western country, would that number in the smallest degree diminish the number in the old states?—not one whit. If that were the case, we should see the planters then using as great exertion to increase their annual product of slaves, as they now are to increase their annual product of sugar and cotton—and we should find that the slaves would re-produce their number every fifteen years. This would be establishing the slave trade in our country with a vengeance. The old states would become a second Africa, overspreading the world with pestilence, misery, and desolation. It is therefore I think plain reasoning *a priori*, that the old slave

states would derive no benefit from introducing slaves into the new.

But we are not obliged to rely on reasoning of this kind to prove the fact. There are cases in point, in our own country familiar to every man which prove it to demonstration. It is well known that Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi, have been almost entirely peopled with slaves from the Carolinas, Virginia and Maryland; and yet in the meantime the number of slaves in each of these states has rapidly increased. Are not these cases in point? are they not parallel? In each of these states slavery has increased faster than the white population, during the period that these different states have been settling. What benefit then, in a political point of view, have the old states derived from this extensive market for their slaves. No man can say they have derived any benefit, who does not hold that slavery is a benefit. And what greater benefit could they expect to derive from extending their market beyond the Mississippi? Individuals I know may be benefitted, (if money made in the slave trade and in raising slaves for sale be a benefit,) but I ask what benefit has the state derived from it in a political point of view? The evil of slavery has been rather increased than diminished in the old states, and the mischief has been extended in all its horrors to the new. If slavery had not been permitted in these new states, they would at this day have been peopled by a more numerous population, entirely white and free, than they now are by both slave and free. This is not only manifest from the nature of the case upon the principles of population, but from the actual experiments that have been made in New-York, Ohio and other states, where there is no slavery. While no benefit has been derived to the old slave states, by the introduction of slaves into the new, who can calculate the injury that has been done to the new states by the

introduction. It would require the intelligence of an angel to point out one half of these evils—one half of them will never be known or imagined, until many a generation yet unborn, shall have passed away. And again let me ask, if the old slave states have derived no benefit from the introduction of slavery into the new on this side the Mississippi, what benefit can they expect from its introduction into the new beyond the Mississippi? I trust no gentleman will disgrace himself by claiming the paltry gain arising from the slave trade, to be a moral or political benefit. I have lastly to show that the introduction of slavery into these new states, will produce a positive political injury to the old slave states. To prove this, it must first be granted that slavery is a political evil, and its perpetuity a thing to be deprecated—that it would be a blessing to the old slave states, if slavery could be extirpated. To those who will not make this *concessum*, I despair of proving any position. If it be granted that slavery is an evil, then its riddance would be a blessing. I flatter myself that it has been already shown that there is one way by which, in the course of time, every state in the union may rid itself of slavery. That way is by a gradual manumission. No other practicable way has ever been suggested, by which this evil can be remedied, and until some other practicable way is pointed out, I shall take it for granted, that this is the only way by which this great and most desirable event can ever be accomplished. Every measure then which tends to retard or prevent putting the manumitting plan into execution, tends to retard and prevent the old states from ever getting rid of slavery—and tends to perpetuate the curse of slavery in all its horrors, and to transmit it to posterity with increased malignity. There can be no question that the introduction of slavery into the new states on this side the Mississippi, has tended, nay, that it has been the primary cause of the laws in the

southern states prohibiting the manumission of slaves, and the introduction of slavery into the states beyond the Mississippi, will strongly tend to perpetuate these laws, and of course, slavery. It produces this effect in many ways. In the first place, this policy has greatly increased the number of slaves, and so rendered it more difficult to manumit them, or to set about their manumission.

It has greatly enhanced the price of slaves, and, in consequence, increased the difficulty of manumission.—In proportion as property is valuable do we fence it about with laws for its protection, and use every means in our power to prevent its depreciation. We may talk as much as we please about patriotism, and public virtue, but the grand spring of action with most men, is self interest. If slaves had not been rendered so valuable by the insatiable market the new states afford, we should not see our statute-books so filled with severe laws respecting runaway slaves,—we should not see them stained and disgraced with penal laws against those who teach the poor slave to read his Bible, and endeavour to imbue his mind with the precepts of our holy religion. If slaves were of less or little value, we should not have men preaching with zeal, the insuperable difficulties of emancipation, and branding with infamy every benevolent society, and every active philanthropist, for spending their lives and their fortunes in alleviating the sufferings of their fellow men.* Gain was the original cause of slavery.—Gain has been the cause of the blacks being kept in slavery, and gain will be the cause of perpetuating their slavery, if indeed, it shall be perpetuated. The most effectual way to keep up their present high price, is to afford an extensive market.—

* Vide the extraordinary production of a writer signing himself An American, lately published in the Gazette from the Intelligence. In the Edinburgh Reviewers were before without a cause for *utroque*, they are so no longer.

There certainly needs no ghost to tell us this. But by keeping up the present high price you promote their increase, and not only this, but you perpetuate their condition. I think it is therefore manifest, that the introduction of slavery into the new states to be formed beyond the Mississippi, will be in a political as well as moral point of view, a positive injury to the old slave states, and every southern gentleman who loves his country, or his white, more than he loves the pitiful gain a free individual slave-trader or slave-raiser might derive from such traffic, ought and will join heart and hand with the northern gentlemen, in preventing the introduction of slavery into these states.

It has, however, been made a question, whether Congress has any right or power under the constitution to restrain the introduction of slavery into the new states. If this be the case, it puts an end to the question, and the horrors of slavery must be permitted to extend through all that western world, to the prejudice of both the new states, and the old; at least, until the constitution can be altered. Is this then the fact?

In the first place, it may be observed, that the constitution is totally silent on the subject, and it is not a little difficult to imagine, how such a monstrous conclusion can be drawn from no premises at all. It certainly cannot be done by any species of logic with which the world is as yet acquainted. The constitution, (art. 4 and 5,) says that "New states may be admitted into the union," but it says nothing about the terms of their admission, except, that "the United States shall guarantee to every state in the union, a republican form of government; and shall protect each of them against invasion, and domestic violence." That is, after they are admitted into the union, congress is required to guarantee to them a republican form of government, but the constitution does not even re-

quire congress to admit any new state into the union,—much less does it pretend to prescribe the terms of their admission. Congress was not bound, even to have admitted a new state into the union.—It might have said, we will admit none but the old thirteen states to a participation of the benefits of the union, which no one would have a right to gainsay.—It may still say the same thing to every new applicant for a participation in these benefits. And if this be the case, does it not follow of course, that congress may prescribe the terms upon which they may be admitted to a participation of these benefits, provided these terms do not interfere with their republican form of government? And will it be pretended, that the inhibition of slavery, would be an infringement of their republican form of government? I should suppose it might, with much more propriety be maintained, that the introduction of slavery would be an infringement of their republican form of government.

At all events, congress has the power of preventing the introduction of slavery into that western world. So long as it remains in a territorial state, congress has the same right to legislate for it, as a state has to legislate for itself, and of course, the right to prohibit the introduction of slaves. If congress prefers keeping it in a territorial state for the purpose of preventing slavery, it may admit it into the union as a slave state, no one will object to the legality of such an exertion of its power. And it would undoubtedly be the duty of congress to do this, rather than permit the introduction of slavery, by admitting it into the union as independent states. If then, these territories will not consent to become members of the union, upon such terms as congress pleases to prescribe, (those terms not affecting their republican form of government,) let them remain territories, and be subject to such laws as Congress see fit to enact.

It was my intention to have examined this branch of the subject much more minutely, but the publication of Mr. King's Speeches in the Senate of the United States, has superseded the necessity of doing it. The foregoing sheets were written, and a part of them in the press, before Mr. King's speeches were published, at least, before I saw them, or I should have omitted saying any thing upon the constitutionality of this question. It would be presumption in me to add any thing upon any subject after Mr. King had communicated his sentiments upon it to the public. I will therefore content myself with referring all who have any doubt on the constitutionality of this question to those speeches, which every man in the non-slaveholding states ought to read, for the purpose of being informed of the political inequalities the introduction of slavery into these states will produce in the burdens of government, and the representation in congress.